

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-32 are pending. Claims 1-21 and 23-32, which are independent, are amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 56-57.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AND §103(a)

Claims 1-6, 19-20, and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,311,194 to Sheth, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Sheth”).

Claims 7-18, 21-25, and 29-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Sheth in view of Official Notice.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein the archiving means issues and archives a tag specifying the metadata; and

retrieving means for retrieving the metadata according to the tag.” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Sheth fails to disclose or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found that teaches or discloses wherein the archiving means issues and archives a tag specifying the metadata, and retrieving means for the metadata according to the tag, as recited in claim 1.

In general, claim 1 recites that a tap specifying the metadata is created and archived for retrieving the metadata. The metadata is retrieved according to the tag. None of the references relied by the Office Action teaches or suggests the above-identified features of claim 1.

Therefore, for at least the above discussed reasons, claim 1 is patentable.

Since claims 2-21 and 23-32 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, claims 2-21 and 23-32 are patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Since the other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, they are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on

each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMERM LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800